

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-23 are pending in this application. Attached hereto is a complete listing of all claims in the application, with their current status listed parenthetically. By this Response, claims 1 and 5 have been amended, and claims 2 and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice to later prosecution.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Pending claims 1-10, 14 and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,587,946 ("Jakobsson"). As discussed below, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A. The Law of Anticipation and Enabling Prior Art References

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id.*

However, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 19 have elements that cannot be found, either expressly or inherently, in Jakobsson. For example, amended independent claim 1 now recites:

"A method for forwarding messages in a multi-node network comprising decrypting, by any forwarding node, any message received by said any forwarding node and encrypting each message transmitted by said any forwarding node."

Jakobsson contains no teaching or suggestion of decrypting any message by any forwarding node, and encrypting each message transmitted by any forwarding node. Instead, Jakobsson, in one aspect of his invention, teaches

"[T]heoretical asymmetric proxy encryption, where the proxy is one physical party, and the proxy has the key that allows him to decrypt the transcript. Such a solution requires a certain amount of trust, since the proxy is able to read the

messages sent to the primary recipient. Therefore, this type of solution appears to be advantageous mainly as a means for speed-up due to **merging the decrypting and encrypting operations into one operation**" (col. 6, lines 31-39).

Thus, this aspect of Jakobsson teaches decrypting a message without subsequently encrypting, or re-encrypting the message.

Jakobsson also teaches decryption that is only decryptable by the secondary recipient:

"Each proxy server modifies the message by **applying their individual share of the key portion of the encrypted message**. The result of this modification is a message **that is secret to the proxy servers** but is decryptable by the secondary recipient" (col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 3).

In this aspect of Jakobsson, the proxy server does not decrypt the message, but instead, adds an additional encryption key, and passes the message on to a secondary recipient, who then decrypts the message.

However, Jakobsson does not teach decrypting, **by any forwarding node**, any message received by said any forwarding node **and also encrypting each message** transmitted by said any forwarding node.

Instead, Jakobsson **either** decrypts the message, **or** adds additional encryption at a forwarding node ("proxy server") but that node **does not** decrypt before adding the additional encryption.

Each of Applicant's independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 19 recite both steps of decrypting any message received and subsequently encrypting any message transmitted.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been traversed, as the cited reference fails to teach or suggest the elements recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 19. Because claims 3-4, 7-8, 10-17 and 20-23 depend from claims 1, 5, 9 and 19, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3-4, 7-8, 10-17 and 20-23 has been traversed by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 5, 9 and 19. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Office Action, claims 11-13 and 15-17 stand rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jakobsson in view of U.S. Patent 6,199,052 ("Mitty"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Because claims 11-13 and 15-17 depend from claim 9 it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 11-13 and 15-17 has been traversed by virtue of their dependency from claim 9. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this Response has addressed all items in the Office Action and now places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-5, 7-17 and 19-23 at an early date is solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: January 4, 2006



Peter R. Martinez
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,845

c/o Pulse~LINK, Inc.
1969 Kellogg Avenue
Carlsbad, California, 92008
Telephone No.: (760) 607-0844